

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/720,150	11/25/2003	Jong Seok Kim	465-1082P	4305	
2292 . 75	590 09/12/2006		EXAMINER		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			PATEL, RITA RAMESH		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1746		
			DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/720,150	KIM ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Rita R. Patel	1746				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence ad	Idress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 No.	ovember 2003.					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	•		e merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	r alastian raquirament					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 November 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	***	• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		•	• •			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P1	O-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		:				
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).				
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •		Stano			
<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau</li> </ol>	•	su in uns Nauonai	Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Priority**

Acknowledgement has been made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. This application claims the benefit of Korean Application No. 10-2002-0075315 filed on November 29, 2002.

### Drawings

The drawings received 11/28/03 are acceptable for examination purposes.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Re claim 5, what does "reinforcement rib is built in one body of the tub" mean? Similarly, re claim 10 what does "protrusion is built in one body of the lip"? Does applicant mean to have written 'built in one part of the tub/lip' or 'built in one piece/integrally with the tub/lip'? Please clarify.

Art Unit: 1746

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kronbetter et al. herein referred to as "Kronbetter" (US Patent No. 6,256,823).

Kronbetter teaches a washing machine 10 with housing 12 having an opening 19 in the front of panel 13. Also, there is a bellows 44 in the front panel 13, therein lying stationary drum 25 and rotating drum 30; bellows 44 reads on applicant's claim for a gasket. The drum is tilted horizontally at a 90 degree angle from a traditional vertical orientation for said washing machine. Tilted drum assemblies in washing machines are commonly known in the art, as they provide increased userability in loading and unloading laundry, and are space efficient in that items may be put on top of the washer, such as a laundry basket and detergent containers, or even a stacked type drying machine.

The bellows 44 embodies a first channel 46 having opposing sidewalls 50, terminating in a first and second fastening means 54, 56; the first fastening means 54 has an axially extending rib 65 engageable with one of the sidewalls of the first channel; and second fastening means 56 which has an axially extending rib 70 and is engageable with one of the sidewalls of the second channel and a radially extending lip

Application/Control Number: 10/720,150

Page 4

Art Unit: 1746

80 engageable with the door, whereby the stationary drum is sealed to the front panel of the washing machine. Kronbetter's teaching of a first fastening member 54 reads on applicant's claim for a support member. Kronbetter's disclosure of fins 69a, 69b, 69c reads on applicant's claim for a reinforcement rib formed on the support member. As seen in Figure 3, there are a plurality of said reinforcement ribs, fins 69a, 69b, 69c, which are illustratively shown to have a predetermined interval from one another. Moreover, as seen by the depression of fins 69a, 69b, 69c in Figure 3, the fins inherently form a predetermined distance from the inner lateral side of the lip, which is nearly equal to the width of an individual fin. Kronbetter's teaching of axially extending rib 65 reads on applicant's claim for a protrusion formed on an inner lateral side of the lip to be contacted with the tub. Moreover, the axially extending rib 65 is formed at a tip of the lip. As seen in Figure 2 of Kronbetter, the protrusion, or axially extending rib 65 is formed at the top and bottom of the washing drum 25, thus reading on applicant's claim wherein the protrusion is plurally formed to leave a predetermined interval from each other. Moreover, as seen in Figure 2, the axially extending rib 65 is formed at a predetermined distance from the stationary drum 25 and the rotating drum 30. Also diagrammed in Figure 2 of Kronbetter are steps 60, 61 and corner bellow portion 44 which read respectively on applicant's claim for a first plane portion coupled to the cabinet, a second plane portion coupled to the tub, and a bending portion connecting the first plane portion to the second plane portion.

Application/Control Number: 10/720,150 Page 5

Art Unit: 1746

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Son et al. (US Patent No. 6,584,814) teaches a washing machine with a tilted tub and drum therein; Son teaches said invention is capable of allowing laundry to be easily put into and taken out of the tilted washing tub and also reduces manufacturing costs by allowing one type of casing to be commonly used for the washing machine with the tilted washing tub and a washing machine with a perpendicular washing tub, and which then allows the parts of the washing machine to be easily attached to the washing machine (col. 2, lines 2-10). Kim et al. (US 2004/0025544) teaches a horizontal washing machine with a gasket 30 for preventing water and laundry received in the drum 20 and tub 10 from being leaked outside the tub10 (Paragraph [0045]). As seen in Figure 2 of Kim et al. the gasket creates a sealing path from the door along a straight away then forms a "Z"-shape and follows along a second horizontal straightaway where it connects with the edge of the drum 20, and finally forms a vertical path which connects with the tub 10.

### **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2, 6, and 11-13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 5, 10-12, and 15 of copending Application No. 10/722,426. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a drum type washing machine with a cabinet, drum, tub, and gasket therein. In addition to a support member between the drum and tub for providing sealing means.

Claims 1-2, 6, and 11-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 7-10 of copending Application No. 10/722,443. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a washing machine including a cabinet, drum, tub, gasket, first, second, and third openings, a gasket, a laundry-stuck preventing part, and a leakage preventing part.

Claims 1-2, 6, and 11-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 9-11 of

Art Unit: 1746

copending Application No. 10/722,455. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a washing machine including a cabinet, drum, tub, gasket, first, second, and third openings, a leakage preventing part, a deformation preventing part, and a laundry-stuck preventing part.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita R. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-8701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/720,150 Page 8

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RRP

MICHAEL BARR SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER